Serial No.: 10/623,923 Filing Date: July 21, 2003

Reply to Office Action of July 1, 2005

## Remarks

Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments, and the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

In the above identified Office Action, the Examiner approved the previously supplied drawings and that approval is appreciated.

## Claim Objections

The Examiner had raised objections to claims 1-13 concerning the issues of whether a combination of the copy holder and a notebook computer was being claimed. Claims 1-13 have, at the Examiner's suggestion, been amended to refer to the combination of the copy older and the notebook computer. Claim 14, however, continues to relate the copy holder itself rather than to a combination. In view of these claim amendments it is respectfully submitted that the previously noted claim objections have been resolved and notice thereof is respectfully requested.

## Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 12-14 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being, in part, indefinite. In particular, claim 12 was rejected due to confusion concerning whether the notebook computer referenced in line 2 was the same one as was originally referenced in claim 1. It is, and claim 12 has been corrected to

Serial No.: 10/623,923 Filing Date: July 21, 2003

Reply to Office Action of July 1, 2005

refer to "the" notebook computer. Approval thereof and removal of the rejection of claim 12 is respectfully requested.

Claim 13 was rejected due to perceived antecedent basis issues. First, claim 13, in line 3 had referred to "a pair of space apart slide supports.." and later, in lines 6 and 7 to "said pair of spaced apart slide supports..". The second feference has antecedent support in line 3. Consequently as to this first issue there is believed to be proper antecedent support. The second issue concerned use of "said cover." The word "cover" has now been corrected to be "lid" to be consistent with other used of "lid" and this is believed to resolve the second issue.

Claim 14 was rejected due to an antecedent issue concerning the pair of slide supports. The first use thereof has now been mended to refer to a pair of "spaced apart" slide supports, and this is believed to resolve the issue raised regarding claim 14.

Approval of each of these claim corrections, and withdrawal of each of the § 112 rejections is respectfully requested. With the exception of claim 14, which was separately rejected, claims 1-13 are believed to now be in allowable condition.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Lavi et al., USP No. 5,987,794. This rejection is traversed, and it is believed that the

Serial No.: 10/623,923 Filing Date: July 21, 2003

Reply to Office Action of July 1, 2005

amendments place claim 14 in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner not agree she is urged to call the undersigned so that allowance of the application, which is otherwise in condition for allowance, can proceed.

Claim 14 has been amended to claim a copy holder and to reflect, to the extent possible, the reasons indicated for the allowance of claims 1- 13.

In particular, the copy holder in claim 14 refers to a pair of spaced apart slide supports, to at least one panel that is secured between upper and lower support members which are, in turn, slidably retained between the pair of spaced apart slide supports, and that each of the pair of spaced apart slide supports is provided with means for separately affixing each to a surface so that the at least one panel and the upper and lower supports remain slidably retained between the pair of spaced apart slide supports. In addition, claim 14 has been amended to also refer to at least one retainer for overlying and holding a sheet of material to the copy holder, as is shown at 40 and 42 in the specification and drawings. Each of these amendments finds support in the specification and in the drawings.

Lavi et al. does not show this claimed copy holder concept, the claimed structure, or the idea of being able to separately affix each of the slide supports to a surface. Lavi et al. does disclose and show a stand alone sign board for use out in open space, and which is supported by a post like stand comprised of a vertical stem 100 and a horizontal base 50. The sign board includes a fully circumscribed outer frame that is provided with a side door 20 that can open to permit a

Serial No.: 10/623,923 Filing Date: July 21, 2003

Reply to Office Action of July 1, 2005

replaceable cartridge 250 to be removed and replaced by another cartridge 250.

Each cartridge includes a panel 200 and a rail member 204 fitted over the top and bottom edge. Each rail 204 includes upstanding rails 206 that fit over guide tracks

45 that are integral with the top and bottom frame members 30 and 40.

Consequently, Lavi et al. does not disclose a copy holder comprised of a pair of the claimed spaced apart slide supports each of which is able to be separately affixed to a surface. Nor does Lavi et al. show the concept of employing two spaced apart slide supports that can be affixed to a surface and have between them a panel held between upper and lower supports that slide within the slide supports relative to the surface. As the application shows, the pair of slide supports are otherwise unconnected to one another save for the panel and its supports. This is not shown, disclosed or suggested by the base stand (the vertical post and the horizontal base) used by Lavi to support his sign board. Further, there is no suggestion to remove each of the side pieces of Lavi's frame so that panel 200 would be providing the support of and the connection between frame pieces 30 and 40.

Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that claim 14, as amended, is not anticipated or rendered obvious by Lavi et al. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested together with a notice that claim 14 is in allowable condition along with claims 1-13.

Serial No.: 10/623,923 Filing Date: July 21, 2003

Reply to Office Action of July 1, 2005

In view of the Examiner's indication that claims 1 13 would be allowable, it is respectfully submitted that claim 14 is now also in condition for allowance, and that all pending claims in this application are in allowable condition. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

**CUSTOMER NUMBER** 

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Peter W. Gowd

Registration No.: 25,872

Davidson Berquist Jackson & Gowdey LLP 4300 Wilson Blvd. 7<sup>th</sup> Floor

Arlington, VA 22203

Main:

(703) 894-6400

FAX:

(703) 894 6430